

# Puget Sound Partnership

our sound, our community, our chance

## 2020 Targets for Recovery of the Puget Sound Ecosystem

### What Are Targets

Targets are policy statements that reflect the region's commitments to and expectations for recovery, or a measurable path to recovery, by 2020. Targets are based on scientific understandings of the ecosystem.<sup>1</sup>

### How Targets Will Be Used

The Partnership will use targets to guide revisions to Action Agenda implementation strategies, focus near-term actions, recommend allocations of funding and other resources to specific strategies and actions, and evaluate Action Agenda implementation.

The Partnership intends for all entities implementing the Action Agenda to make use of these targets as they identify and design activities that contribute to ecosystem recovery, allocate funding and other resources for Puget Sound recovery, and evaluate the effects of their investments and activities.

### Process To Adopt Targets

Staff, subject-matter experts, the Science Panel, and implementing agencies and stakeholders are providing support to the Leadership Council's June 2011 decisions about 2020 targets by:

- Describing what is known about conditions needed for a functioning and resilient ecosystem; and
- Developing and evaluating a number of viable options for statements about desired conditions for 2020 that reflect (i) the understanding of what is (ultimately) needed for a functioning and resilient ecosystem and (ii) what is possible to achieve given understandings of the constraints of biophysical processes and social and economic conditions.

Technical materials developed by subject-matter experts and reviewed by Science Panel members are being used to convey the state of the science to support target setting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applying a U.S. Fish and Wildlife definition of the "SMART" mnemonic for developing performance objectives, targets will be (S) specific, (M) measurable, (A) achievable, (R) results-oriented, and (T) time-fixed. For the Puget Sound Partnership, "results-oriented" would mean that the target would relate to ambitions for a recovered Puget Sound ecosystem.

During April and early May 2011, implementing agencies, local governments, tribes, stakeholders, and subject-matter experts met in workshops and provided written comments on technical materials to identify a range of target options for each target-setting topic.

On May 24 and 25, 2011 the Ecosystem Coordination Board convenes a work session to review target options for ecosystem recovery and provide an opportunity for each caucus to provide constructive feedback about the levels of specificity, measurability, achievability, results-orientation and timeframe for each target option for consideration by the Leadership Council.

On May 26, 2011 the Salmon Recovery Council convenes to review target options for ecosystem recovery and provide constructive feedback about the levels of specificity, measurability, achievability, results-orientation and timeframe for each target option for consideration by the Leadership Council.

On June 16 and 17, 2011 the Leadership Council convenes to review target options and make decisions on which targets to adopt. The review and deliberation of the Leadership Council will include a summary of the perspectives shared through previous forums and the written comments provided to the Puget Sound Partnership. Technical materials developed by subject-matter experts and the Science Panel's review of technical materials will help the Leadership Council understand the state of the science related to each target option. For some target setting topics, the conditions needed for a functioning and resilient system will not be known in spring 2011.<sup>2</sup> In these instances, the Leadership Council might decide to establish targets based on the available information or might decide to not set targets until the necessary information can be developed.

---

<sup>2</sup> This might occur because of a lack of scientific understanding (e.g., what is the threshold of shoreline armoring beyond which specific ecosystem functions are lost?) or because the definition of "functioning" depends on social values as well as biophysical considerations (e.g., how much recreational and provisioning service do Puget Sound residents and institutions expect to obtain from recreational fishing?).